Botore the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

MM Docket No. 92-6

ORIGINAL

In re Applications of

NORKANDY BROADCASTING CORP.

For Renewal of License of Station WYLR(FM) (95.9 Mhs) Glans Fells, New York

and

LAWRENCE N. BRANDT

For a Construction Permit for a new PM Station on 95.9 Mhz at Glens Fails, New York

To: Administrative Law Judge Richard L. Sippel File No. BRH -910129UR

PECEIVED

APR 1 3 1992

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

. File No. BPH-910430MB

MOTION TO MODIFY AND BRIARGE LEEGUES

Normandy Broadcasting Corporation, pursuant to ORDER FCC 92M-381 issued March 25, 1992, hereby potitions for the Enlargement of Issues with regards to the application of Lawrence N. Brandt (Brandt) for a construction permit on 95.9 Mhz:

- (A) To determine whether Brandt purposely deceived the commission as to Normandy's Certification on its renewal regarding whether it had placed materials in its public file at appropriate times.
- (B) To determine whether Brandt purposely withheld information from the FCC and Normandy in his application for his CP on 95.9 Mhz in Glens Falls.

(A) Purposely Deceiving the Commission

- 1. In Brandt's Petition to Modify of February 24, 1992, on page 3, Brandt states "Normandy's cortification that it had placed the tists in WYLR's public files at the appropriate times was clearly fatse" (see Exhibit A).
- 2. In his Supplement of March 30, 1992, he again states "Normandy's representation....that it had done so was false' (see Exhibit B).
- 3. An copied from its public file, (see Exhibit C), and as confirmed this day by Mm. Kelson in the FCC Public Dockets branch, Normandy clearly checked "No" to question 8 on the renewal form and tried to hencetly explain its errors.
- 4. As even the most cursory examination of the Normandy Renewal file would have shown this "No", we must surmise that Brandt

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

purposely abused and misropresented facts in an effort to perhaps, drive Normandy out of this proceeding.

(B) Did Brandt Purposely Withhold Information

- 1. In his application filed April 29, 1991, file BPH-910430MB, in question 7 (a) Brandt admits an ownership interest, but in his exhibit A states his only interest is in "Torjaq Inc." said interest being sold in 1988 (see Exhibit b).
- 2. In recently obtained information, it seems Brandt in fact was one party in interest to no less than 8 applications before the FCC for new stations (see Exhibit E) dating from October 25, 1985 to March, 1992.
- 3. It is truly incredulous that any individual could forget 1 appliation, much less 8 or perhaps more, and a question stands as to why Mr. Brandt would try to hide this virtual shopping bag tull of active pending broadcast stations from this court.

Wherefore, for the forgoing reasons, Lynch respectfully requests that the Petition be granted and that issues (a) and (b) be added against Lawrence Brandt.

Christopher P Lynch, Prosident Normandy Broadcasting Corporation

217 Dix Avenue

Glens Falls, NY 12601

(518) 793-4444

Dated: April 13, 1992

1289

ist Quarter 2nd Ouarter 3rd Quarter 4th Onarter

No list exists for this quarter - dan 11 PSAs; no substantive FM programs distant PSAd; one live simulcast of a rock concert

PSAs: one 4 hour live remote,

1990

1st Quarter

Juna. PSAs: live remotes totalling less

The foregoing chart shows that during at least seven calendar quarters of the last license term, Normandy did not place in WYLR's public file the information that it was required to place in the file pursuant to Section 73.3526(a)(9) of the Commission's rules. Moreover, as reflected on the face of the attached lists, the Issues/Programs lists covering WYLR's public file for the last three quarters of 1989 and the first quarter of 1990 were not prepared until Juna 12, 1990. Thus, even assuming that the content of those Issues/Programs lists met the minimum requirements of Soction 73.3526(9), Normandy's certification that it had placed the lists in WYLR's public file at the appropriate time was clearly false since Section 73,3526(9) of the Rules requires that lists be placed in the public file by the tenth day of the aucceeding calendar quarter.

The Issue of Normandy's Character Qualifications Should be Modified Accordingly

Jo Rarry Skidelsky, 6 FCC Rod. 2221 (released April 29, 1991), Administrative Law Judge Kuhlmann held that Normandy was disqualified to operate a proposed FM facility in Queensbury, New York, under three issues:

Normandy has not demonstrated that it had reasonable assurance for its first antenna site,

Exhibet B

programs" and submitted a supplemental "list of broadcasts which WYLR has aired."

The Heckman Declaration and the Frasier Affidavit which are part of the record in MM Docket 90-181 provide the requisite substantiation that the issues/programs lists attached to the Patition constitute the only issues/programs lists for WYLR that Normandy had prepared and placed in that station's public file as of June, 1990 for the period from January, 1987 to June, 1990. The Lynch Declaration which is also a part of the record in MM Docket 90-181 provides further corroboration for this fact. The issues sought in the Petition relate solely to whether Normandy's representation in WYLR's license renewal application that it had placed the required documentation concerning the issues that WYLR had dealt with in its programming in the station's public file at the or propriate times. The materials attached hereto establish a prima facie case that during the period from January, 1987 to June, 1990, Normandy did not place the required documentation in WYDR's the issues/programs at the appropriate times and that Normandy's representation in WYLR's renewal application that it had done so was false

Respectfully submitted,

David Tillotade

Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin

& Kahn

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 857-6027

Date: March 30, 1992

Ext C CAL

| | .e $\phi_{\rm BEA}$ in compliance with the provisions of Section 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as hended, relating to interests of sites and foreign governments? | X res | ☐ N¢ |
|----|---|--|----------|
| | If No. attach as Exhibit No an explanation. | | |
| 5. | Since the life of the applicant's test renewal application for this station or other major application, has an adverse the high bean made or final action bean taken by any court or administrative body with respect to the applicant or parties to the application in a civil or criminal proceeding brought under the provisions of any law relating to the following: any felony; breadcast related antitrust or unfair competition; criminal fraud or fraud before abother governmental unit; or discrimination? 800 exhibit 2 | Ves | X No |
| | If Yes, \$15.00th as Exhibit No a full description of the parsons and matters involved, including an identification of the court or administrative body and the proceeding (by dates and file numbers) and the disposition of the litigation. | | |
| 7. | Would a Composition grant of this application come within 47 CFR, Section 1.1007, such that it may have a significant environmental impact? | T Yes | X No |
| | if Yes, altach as Exhibit No an Environmental Assessment required by 47 CFR, Section 1,1311. If No. explain briefly why not, | | |
| ð. | Has the apply his placed in its station's public inspection file at the appropriate times the documentation required by 47 CFR, Sections 73,3520 or 73,3827? | Ven | K Ne |
| | if No, eithch as Exhibit No4_ a complete statement of explanation. | | |
| CE | The APPLICATION: I worldy water any claim to the use of any particular frequency or of the electromagnetic specialists provide the United Status because of the provided use of the same, whether by Ileanus or externity harlestion in arrordance with this application. (See Bestion 304 of the Communications Act of 1934, as smanded.) The APPLICATION: echnomizedges that all the electromite undo in this application and attached sublists are resentations and that all the exhibite are presentations and that all the exhibite are a material part hereof and are insosperated herein as eat out in full in RTFICATION: I worldy that the exterments in this application are true, complete, and correct to the best of | e, and reg canaidared the applicat | motorial |
| _ | ilef, and the made in good faith. | | |
| 1 | Christopher P. Lynch | | |
| [" | President and General Manager Dule 1/23-91 | | |
| | WILLFLY FALSE STATEMENTS MACE ON THIS FURM ARE PUBLISHED BY FINE AND WITHISOMENT. UN COOK. THEE 18, SE | CHON 1001. | |

•





🚻 Normandy Broadcasting Corporation 😘

217 Dix Ave., Glens Palls, NI 12801 . 318-703-4144 . Dax 702-9374

EXHIBIT 4

8. We relieve we have, and in good faith, have attempted, to place all appropriate documentation required by 47 C.F.R. sections 73.3526 or 73.3527 to be in our files at the appropriate Upon close examination, one of these reports was missing. The only logical explanation is that in preparing applications for the NAB's Crystal Awards recognizing superior public mervice accomplishments, (we have been one of 50 finalists nationwide for the past 3 years) we referred to this quarter and then misplaced it. Also, upon a close examination a few quarterly liats seemed to inadequately roffect our offects. While these lists were timely filed, I drafted additions to them, and with cover letters clearly showing the dates they were completed made them part of our issues/programs lists. I have also annexed our above mentioned Crystal Award entries to our issues/program lists and I believe not only are we in compliance with 47 C.F.R. Sections 73.3526 or 73.3527, but that this file fairly reflects our services to our community of license.

| \$ | getion to - Legal QUALIFICATIONS (Page 3) | Exhibit D |
|-----|--|---------------------|
| 7. | Does the applicant, any party to the application or any non-party equity ewner in the applicant have, or have they had, any interest in: | |
| | (a) a broadunct station, or pending broadoust station application before the Commission? | No □ Yes □ No |
| | (b) a brog-focus application which has been dismissed with prejudice by the Commission? | Y= X No |
| | (c) a broadness application which has been denied by the Commission? | Y== [X] No |
| | (d) a Bros ick t station, the license of which has been revoked? | Yes 🗓 No |
| | (e) a broad-set application in any pending or concluded Commission proceeding which left unresolved character issues against the applicant? | □ Y = X No |
| | If the answer to any of the questions in (a) (a) above is Yes, state in an Exhibit the following information: | Exhibit No. |
| | (i) Name of party having interest; (2) Nations of interest or connection, giving dates; (3) Call tertains of stations or file number of application or docket; and (4) Location | |
| 6. | (a) Are any of the parties to the application or non-party equity ewhere in the applicant related (as hushand, wife, father, mother, brother, stater, son or daughter) to each other? | Tes X No |
| | (b) Dord any member of the immediate family (i.e., husband, wife, father, mother, brother, sister, son or daughter) of any party to the application or non-party equity ewner in the applicant have any interest in or connection with any other breadoust station, pending broadoust application or newspaper in the same area free Section 22,2555(e)) or, in the case of a television station applicant only, a cable television system in the same area free feeties 25 \$216935. | Y = X No |
| | If the answer to (a) or (b) above is Yea stach an Exhibit giving full disclosure concerning the persons invo;ved, their relationship, the nature and extent of such interest or connection, the file number of such application, and the location of such station or proposed station. | Exhibit No. |
| 9 | State in an Exhibit any interest the applicant or any party to this application proposes to divest in the event of a grant of this application. | Exhibit No. DNA |
| | OTHER MADE MEDIA INTERESTS | |
| 10. | (a) Do individuals or entitles holding nonattributable interests of \$50 at more in the applicant have an attributable expensive interest of corporate efficiently or directorately in a broadcast station, newspaper or CATV system in the same area? (See Instructors I to Section II.) | [] Y# [] No |
| | (b) Done any member of the immediate family (i.e., husband, wife, father, mother, brother, sister, son or desginer) of an individual holding a nonetributable interest of \$40 or more in the applicant have any interest in or connection with any other broadcast station, pending broadcast application, newspaper in the same area (see Section 7). History, or, in the case of a television station applicant only, a cable television system in the same area (see Section 74.58)(a))? | [] Y = [] No |
| | If the snaws, to (a) and/or (b) above is Yes, stach an Exhibit giving a full disclosure concerning the persons involved, their relationship, the nature and extent of such interest of connection, the file number of such application, and the location of such station or proposed station. | Exhibit Na DVA |

AM 1818

Application (FCC Form 301 for Construction Permit Glens, Palls, New York

EXHIBIT A

Applicant was a nonvoting stockholder in Torjaq, Inc. which filed an application (BPH-851213MD) for a construction point for a new FN station in White Rock, New Mexico in 1985 and was awarded a permit for the station in 1987. Applicant sold his interest in Torjaq, Inc. in 1988.

(THERMOLITH & HTLLSONS)
HELLEGIST OF THE STATES

7856-34-0-83

9.00, § ASSOCIATES

Apolication for CONDITIONAL LICENSE FOR A NEW STATION Dismissed without prejudice by the Compission C3/12/1982.

Apolication appeared on public matter dated 10/25/1985.

BLOCK & ASSOCIATES

ADDITION TO CONDITIONAL LICENSE FOR A NEW STATION Dismissed without prejudice by the Commission 03/12/1992,

ADDITION ECCERTED BY THE CONDITIONAL LICENSE FOR A NEW STATION Dismissed without prejudice by the Commission 03/12/1992,

ADDITION ECCERTED BY THE CONDITIONAL LICENSE FOR A NEW STATION DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE BY THE COMMISSION 03/12/1992.

1912-Q1-9-83

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, ROBE M. ANGELO, a secretary in the office of Normandy Broadcasting

MOTION TO

Corporation do hereby curlify that a copy of the foregoing Necessary

MODIFY AND ENCALGE ISSUES

DEPOSITION has been sent via U.S. Mail, First-Class postage prepaid

this 13th day of April, 1992 to the following:

Administrative Law Judge Richard L. Sippel Federal Communications Commission 2000 L Street, N.W., Room 212 Washington, D.C. 20554

Paulette Laden, Esq. Federal Communications Commission Hearing Branch, Enforcement nivision 2025 M Street, N.W., Room 7212 Washington, D.C. 20554

David Tillotson Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn 1650 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 857-6027

Box1x augele